NOES—11.

1.	Mr. A. N. Visvanatha Pillai	7.	Mr. S. Piraviperumal Pillai
2.	„ K. Sankaralingam Pillai	8.	„ M. N. Paramesvaran Pillai
3.	„ N. Ramakrishna Pillai	9.	„ P. Padmanabhan Tampi
4.	„ M. P. Madhavan Pillai	10.	„ N. K. Padmanabha Pillai
5.	„ V. S. Arumukham Pillai	11.	„ K. P. Nilakanta Pillai
6.	„ Haji Hassan Yacoob Sait		

NEUTRALS—5.

1.	Mr. John Kattakayam	4.	Mr. M. N. Narayana Menon
2.	„ M. Govindan	5.	„ K. Padmanabha Panikkar
3.	„ C. M. Joseph		

The motion was declared carried and the Bill was passed in the form in which it was recommended to the House.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.

P. W. D.—Roads Buildings and Irrigation.

Mr. G. B. E. Truscott: Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1,07,000 for (i) payment to the contractors for the construction of the bridge over Periyar at Neriamangalam—Rs. 37,000 and (ii) for the Leper Colony at Noornad—Rs. 70,000.

The first item, regarding the Neriamangalam bridge is for the payment of the withheld sums of money due to the contractors. According to the terms of the contract the Bill need not be paid for a period not less than six months and not more than 12 months. There were other conditions also. One condition was that the bridge should withstand two floods, but unfortunately we have not had two floods. Now the bill has become due and the money has to be paid according to the contract.

Mr. M. N. Paramesvaran Pillai: May I know from the member whether the whole amount now claimed belongs to the contractors as deposits made by them or is due to them for the work done?

Mr. G. B. E. Truscott: Most of it is retention money.

Mr. M. N. Paramesvaran Pillai: May I know how much is retention money?

Mr. G. B. E. Truscott: Practically the whole.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. M. N. Paramesvaran Pillai : May I know from the member whether at the time of the last budget Government knew that this amount had to be paid to the contractors ?

Mr. G. B. E. Truscott : The bridge was finished in March 1935 and we did not know the exact amount of money that was then due to the contractors. Hence it was not included in the last budget.

The second amount, namely, Rs. 70,000 is required for work at Noornad. I would say there are three estimates, two of which have been sanctioned which are being worked out now. No funds have been provided for the third estimate although it has been sanctioned. And full funds for the second estimate have also not been provided. The money is required for completing works which have to be done before the patients can be admitted into the permanent quarters. They are now occupying temporary quarters. We want to get the whole work inside the infectious area completed because once the patients are moved into the permanent quarters, no workman will go inside that area. I therefore move for the grant of Rs. 70,000 for this purpose.

Mr. M. N. Paramesvaran Pillai May I know for how many patients there will be accommodation in the buildings ?

Mr. G. B. E. Truscott : Five hundred.

Mr. M. N. Paramesvaran Pillai : Sir, I oppose the entire demand. As regards the 2nd portion of the demand, I have to point out that it is a colossal folly to spend huge sums of money for the erection of pucca buildings to house the lepers. A sum of Rs. 70,000 is now asked for the leper colony at Noornad. Why should Government allow public money to be spent for putting up costly buildings for such purposes ? A time may come when the hospital will have to be shifted from Mavelikara just as it was removed from Trivandrum. There is already some agitation against the location of this hospital at Mavelikara, and if after some time this agitation gains strength and the Government find it necessary to yield to the wisdom of such agitation these costly buildings that we propose to put up will become practically useless. For, buildings used for housing lepers cannot be used for any other purpose. The Government, I believe, are even now realising such a difficulty, for they do not really know what they should do with the existing buildings used for the leper asylum at Oolampara. Should we not at least grow wise after a folly ?

As regards the first part of this demand also, I wish to make a few remarks. The Neriamangalam Bridge was completed in February 1935 and it was formally opened by His Highness the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. N. Parameswaran Pillai.]

Maha Raja on the 2nd March in the same year. Two full summers and two long winters have since gone by and much water of the Periyar river has flown beneath this bridge.

President : Have we got any winter here ?

Mr. M. N. Paramesvaran Pillai : We have two monsoons corresponding to the winters.

And it is at this distance of time the Chief Engineer has now come to this House with a supplementary demand for payment of money to contractors who executed the work. Does it not smack something really undesirable or unsatisfactory in the working of the Department ? Whether the necessity for this additional grant was caused either on account of unforeseen circumstances resulting in the execution of additional work while the construction was in progress or on account of defective engineering skill in the preparation of the original estimate, the Chief Engineer could not in any event plead any valid excuse for not including the amount in the budget for the current year.

Mr. S. Piraviperumal Pillai : Did he not say that he was not able to know previously what was the amount due to the contractor ?

Mr. M. N. Paramesvaran Pillai : I do not think the Chief Engineer will be so foolish as to say that, at the time of the last budget which was considered by this House several months after the bridge was thrown open for traffic, he did not know that so much more funds would be required for payment of the contractors' bills. It must be presumed that the Chief Engineer was aware before the completion of the bridge or at any rate when the contractors submitted the completion bill that this excess amount was also required to satisfy the full discharge of all liabilities in connection with the work. The Chief Engineer has not, in my opinion, placed before us any convincing reason so that this House may judiciously exercise its right of vote on this demand.

In the matter of considering supplementary demands, this House is always placed at a great disadvantage, for in such a case full and useful discussion will be stifled by technicalities of rules and the House will not have full freedom and opportunity to view the question in all its perspective. For, even in this particular instance there are a lot of things to be said against the department, but I am sure if discussion is allowed to range over those subjects, the President will call me to order. In these circumstances, the Chief Engineer cannot in justice and fairness expect this House to give its assent to this motion.

The demand was then put to vote and carried.

The grant was made.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly